2002 Evaluation Criteria for WRIA 5 Project Proposals

The Stillaguamish Lead Entity will use the following criteria to evaluate the benefit to salmon, certainty of success, and socioeconomic impacts of all 4th Round Salmon Grant applications to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board.

Benefit to Salmon (50 pts)

a) How does the project directly benefit the abundance, diversity, and distribution of a listed salmonid species? **(10 pt)**

b) How does the project protect and reconnect habitat? **(10 pt)**

c) How does the project protect and restore natural ecosystems processes? **(10 pt)**

d) How does the project solve the cause of the problem, not the symptom? **(10 pt)**

e) Does the project have a broad geographic effect? **(5 pt)**

f) What is the documentation for this project, its importance/priority and the salmonid limiting factors addressed by the work? Identify watershed analyses, plans, or research.[1] **(5 pt)**

Certainty of Success (25 pts)

g) What is the likelihood of completion within 2-3 years? Explain if the full certainty of benefit from the project may take longer to achieve. **(5 pt)**

h) Does the project require limited maintenance, work with natural ecosystem processes, and is it self-sustaining? **(5 pt)**

i) Are project design, methods, and materials appropriate in scale and complexity to efficiently accomplish the work? **(5 pt**)

j) Are monitoring plans or elements incorporated into already existing monitoring systems (e.g., stream gauging, enumeration of outmigrants) wherever possible? Where not appropriate, is new monitoring occurring at the watershed level or larger scale? For acquisitions, explain how a land management plan will direct the stewardship of the property in the future. **(5 pt)**

k) What is the project's relation to previous habitat projects on site or nearby? Does it build on or correct previous work? **(5 pt)**

Socioeconomic Impacts (25 pts)

l) Does the project have community support in terms of volunteer contributors and/or local partners? **(5 pt)**

m) What proportion of total cost is in the form of matching funds (one point for each 10% greater than 15% total)? **(5 pt)**

n) What alternatives were considered during the project design phase? Is this project the least cost alternative to achieve the desired outcome? **(5 pt)**

o) Does the project produce secondary community benefits (e.g., increased public safety, decreased risk of property damage, improvements to physical infrastructure)? **(5 pt)**

p) Does the project enhance community education about the watershed? What are the outreach elements of the project? **(5 pt)**

---

[1] Selected relevant literature:

- Collins, Brian. 1997. Effects of Land Use on the Stillaguamish River, Washington, ~1870 to ~1990: Implications for Salmonid Habitat and Water Quality and Their Restoration. Final Report to Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians.
- Pess, G.R., B.D. Collins, M. Pollock, T.J. Beechie, S. Grigsby, and A. Haas. 1999. Historic and Current Factors That Limit Coho Salmon (Oncorhynchus kisutch) Production in the Stillaguamish River Basin, Washington State: Implications for Salmonid Habitat Protection and Restoration. Prepared for Snohomish County Department of Public Works and the Stillaguamish Tribe.
- Pollock, M. 1997. An Analysis of Current and Historic Riparian Conditions in the Stillaguamish Watershed. Report by the 10,000 Years Institute. Seattle, WA.
- Stillaguamish Technical Advisory Group. 2002. Stillaguamish Watershed – WRIA 5 Salmonid Habitat Evaluation, Version 1.02. Everett, WA.
- Stillaguamish Technical Advisory Group. 2000. Technical Assessment and Recommendations for Chinook Salmon Recovery in the Stillaguamish Watershed. Everett, WA.
- US Army Corps of Engineers. 2000 Stillaguamish Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study – Final Report. Seattle, WA.
- Washington State Conservation Commission. 1999. Salmon Habitat Limiting Factors Water Resource Inventory Area 5, Stillaguamish Watershed. Olympia, WA.